

VOLUME VII NOVEMBER, DECEMBER, 1921 NUMBERS 7-8

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING

PUBLISHED BY

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD

CAMBRIDGE

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Announcements	PAGE
Nominations for Officers	3
Annual Meeting	3
Constitutional Amendments	7
Report of Nominating Committee	8
American Council on Education	8
American University Union in Europe	11
Report of the Council	13
Report of the Secretary	15
Notes from Committees	
Methods of Appointment and Promotion.....	17
Methods of Increasing Intellectual Interest.....	17
Notes from Local Branches	
University of Minnesota	18
Reasons for Local Branches	21
Recent Educational Discussion	
Faculty Participation in University Government, <i>Thomas C. Chamberlain</i>	23
Comment on Professor Chamberlain's Letter, <i>J. A.</i> <i>Leighton</i>	29
University Morale, <i>W. L. Bryan</i>	32
Government of Universities, <i>J. F. Snell</i>	35
Matriculation Address, <i>J. R. Angell</i>	35
Occupational Description of Faculty Positions, <i>W. D.</i> <i>Scott</i>	37
Present College Problems, <i>Samuel Avery</i>	41
Gifts to Universities, <i>Nicholas Murray Butler</i>	42
National Educational Surveys, <i>S. P. Capen</i>	42
The Failure of the College, <i>J. Crosby Chapman</i>	45
Membership	
Nominations for Membership.....	48

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

This issue contains certain matters required to be circulated to members thirty days before the annual meeting including in particular certain constitutional amendments and the report of the Nominating Committee.

The Presidential Address and the Treasurer's Report will be presented at the annual meeting and published later.

NOMINATIONS FOR OFFICERS.—The first by-law of the Association requires that blanks shall be provided upon which additional nominations by members may be made. As post-office regulations prevent inclosing a separate slip, members desiring to present such nominations are requested to do so in the following form:

I hereby nominate the following names for the offices mentioned:

President

Vice-President

Secretary

Treasurer

Councillors (not to exceed ten).....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting will be held at Pittsburgh, Thursday and Friday, December 29 and 30, in connection with the annual meetings of the American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association. Headquarters will be at the William Penn Hotel. The local committee consists of Evan T. Sage, Francis Tyson, G. F. Becknell, G. E. Jones and Charles Arnold. Further announcements may be circulated to officers of local branches in advance of the meeting.

Attention is particularly called to the following provision of the constitution:

"Article X.— . . Members of the Association in each institution may elect one or more delegates to the annual meeting. At the annual meeting questions shall ordinarily be determined by majority vote of the delegates present and voting, but on request of one-third of the delegates present a proportional vote shall be taken. When a proportional vote is taken the delegates from each institution shall be entitled to one vote and, in case of an institution with more than fifteen members of the Association, to one vote for every ten members or majority fraction thereof. The votes to which the delegates from each institution are entitled shall be equally divided among its delegates present and voting."

It is particularly hoped by the officers that every local branch which can possibly arrange for representation by one or more members will do so, in order that the meeting may be representative of the whole Association.

A reduction of one and one-half fare on the "Certificate Plan" will apply for members attending the meeting (and also for dependent members of their families) except from points in Pennsylvania.

Tickets at the regular one-way tariff fare for the going journey may be obtained December 23-29. Be sure that when purchasing your going ticket you request a CERTIFICATE.

Certificates are not kept at all stations. If not obtainable at your home station, you can purchase a local ticket to the station which has certificates. On your arrival at the meeting, present your certificate to the Secretary, as the reduced fare for the return journey will not apply unless you are properly identified.

The Special Agent of the carriers will be in attendance on December 29, from 8.30 A.M. to 5.30 P.M., to validate certificates. If you arrive at the meeting and leave for home again prior to the Special Agent's arrival, or if you arrive at the meeting later than December 29, you cannot have your certificate validated and consequently you will not obtain the benefit of the reduction on the home journey.

If the necessary minimum of 350 certificates are presented to the Special Agent, and your certificate is duly validated, you will be entitled, up to and including January 3, 1922, to a return ticket, via the same route over which you made the going journey, at one-half of the regular one-way tariff fare from the place of the meeting to the point at which your certificate was issued.

Preliminary Program

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29

1.00 P.M. Registration of delegates and members.

If several delegates are present from the same institution one should be designated as voting representative in case of a proportional vote.

2.00 P.M. *First Session.*

(1) Organization on basis of delegate representation. Roll-call of delegates from local branches.

(2) Brief reports of progress from committees not having special assignments of time in the program.

(3) Report from Committee A—Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure.

(4) Report from Committee T—Place and Function of College and University Faculties.

The following topics are proposed for discussion by Local Branches and at the Annual Meeting:

1. Should the formal consent of the faculty be prerequisite to all changes in educational policy?

2. If No. 1 be answered in the affirmative what should be the medium for the interchange of views between trustees and faculty—

a. The President alone; or

b. Conference Committees on University Policy; or

c. Faculty representation on the Board of Trustees?

3. Should the faculty participate in the nomination of administrative officers including the President?

4. Should the faculty, acting through appropriate committees, of which the administrative officers are *ex officio* members, make nominations for appointments and promotions on the teaching staff?

5. Does not an affirmative answer to No. 4 carry with it the obligation on the part of the faculty to take the initiative in removing from the teaching staff incompetent as well as unworthy members? Are not professors derelict in so far as they shirk responsibility for maintaining and increasing the efficiency of the teaching staff?

6. Should the effective salary scale for various ranks on the teaching staff require the formal approval of the faculty?

7. Is it not true that the so-called autocratic and bureaucratic methods of administrators and trustees are frequently due to the failure of professors to interest themselves in and to form and express views upon educational policies and practices, and to their unreadiness to work on committees or perform administrative duties beyond the range of their own department? Is it not seriously inconsistent for professors to demand a more effective voice in administration if they fail to discharge faithfully the administrative and governing duties in hand? Is there any fundamental incompatibility, barring exceptional instances, between being a competent specialist and being efficient in the discharge of governing and administrative duties?

The chairman of Committee A is expected to review its recent work and to present data about methods of dismissal in representative institutions.

5.00 P.M. Meetings of the Council and committees.

8.00 P.M. Address by President Seligman.

9.00 P.M. *Smoker with American Economic Association and affiliated societies.*

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30

9.00 A.M. Meeting of the Council.

10.00 A.M. *Second Session.*

(1) Reports from the Officers.

(2) Recommendations from the Council.

(3) Discussion of report from Committee H—
Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students (printed in the October BULLETIN).

The following topics are prepared for discussion by Local Branches and at the Annual Meeting:

1. Is there a tendency for too liberal acceptance of Bachelor's degrees on the part of graduate schools to the detriment of the standard of the Ph.D. degree?

2. Should a closer contact be established between graduate students and advanced undergraduates, at least with seniors, as a general university policy, aside from the limited contact in departments?

3. Should the leading universities come to an informal agreement in regard to the scholarly work which may be done with distinction at particular institutions for the purpose of properly supporting these fields, directing graduate students in these fields to the institutions where they may find the best opportunities for their work, and for the purpose of avoiding costly and unnecessary expansion?

4. Traveling fellowships *vs.* resident fellowships.(4) Discussion of preliminary report by Committee
Z—Economic Condition of the Profession.

The following topics are prepared for discussion by Local Branches and at the Annual Meeting:

1. Is it becoming easier or more difficult to recruit college faculties with men of the right caliber and training?

2. Are provisions for sabbatical leave sufficiently liberal to enable university professors to take advantage of them as often as desirable from the standpoint of their highest usefulness as teachers?

3. Are retiring allowances or insurance provisions sufficient to relieve university professors from financial worry as to their old age to a degree that will enable them to do their best work during their active years?

(5) Constitutional Amendments.

(6) Report of Nominating Committee and election
of Officers.

(7) Unfinished and miscellaneous business.

An afternoon session may be held if needed.

A meeting of the Council for 1922 will be held on adjournment of the meeting of the Association.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.—Three constitutional amendments are presented for action, as follows:

Amend Article II, section 1, by inserting after college:

"(not including independent junior colleges)."

Amend Article III, section 1, second sentence, to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of section 3 of this article the term of office of the President," etc.

Amend Article III, section 3, by adding:

"Whenever a vacancy occurs in any office, because of the death, resignation, or disability of the officer concerned, the Council shall have power to fill the vacancy, but the person so chosen shall hold office only until the next annual meeting. Whenever the annual meeting fails to elect a successor to an officer whose term is about to expire such officer shall continue to hold office until a successor is elected at the next annual meeting, provided, however, that the Council shall have power in its discre-

tion to elect a successor to such retiring officer, but the person so elected shall hold office only until the next annual meeting."

Add new Article:

ARTICLE XI

"Local Branches. Whenever the members in a given institution number seven or more, they shall constitute a Local Branch of the Association. Each Local Branch shall elect annually in the month of January a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, and such other officers as the Local Branch may determine. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Local Branch to report to the Secretary of the Association the names of the officers of the Branch. In case of the failure of any Local Branch to elect the officers above provided for, the President, Secretary and Treasurer of the Association shall have power, and it shall be their duty to appoint, from the institution concerned, officers for the Local Branch in question."

REPORT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE.—The Nominating Committee presents the following recommendations for officers for 1922:

President, J. V. Denney, Ohio State

Vice-President, Henry Crew, Northwestern

Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Inst. Tech.

Treasurer, W. T. Semple, Cincinnati

For Members of the Council for Term ending January 1, 1925:

Stanley Coulter (Biology), Purdue

Tenney Frank (Latin), Johns Hopkins

Edward Everett Hale (English), Union

W. E. Henderson (Chemistry), Ohio State

John A. Miller (Astronomy), Swarthmore

Walter Miller (Greek), Missouri

W. A. Nitze (Romance Languages), Chicago

J. B. Pratt (Philosophy), Williams

M. S. Slaughter (Latin), Wisconsin

W. L. Westermann (History), Cornell

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The October issue of *The Educational Record* is devoted mainly to the full report of the annual meeting in May. The Director is "convinced that the true sphere of the Council should be the study of larger questions of educational policy. The Council should be the medium

through which the best opinion in the field of educational administration may be focussed on the most important problems which confront large groups of institutions. An agency sufficiently representative to undertake these tasks is now more needed than ever. . . . ”

As illustration of the need reference is made to Federal legislation in regard to a department of education or of public welfare. The Council may “be called upon to help present to Congress the views of educational officers regarding certain essential elements in a new Government office designed to coordinate the Government’s educational activities. . . . ”

“A definition of college standards that will be generally accepted and that will both stimulate and do justice to collegiate institutions must be agreed upon with the next few years. In bringing this to pass the Council obviously has an important rôle to play. . . . ”

“Intimately connected with the movement, however, is the necessity of a review of the whole situation of colleges of arts and sciences, because an entity can scarcely be standardized or defined until there is substantial agreement with respect to its purposes and distinguishing characteristics. . . . ”

“There is a certain parallelism in the field of higher education. With equal pertinence one might ask the question: ‘Why Four Years?’ If four years is regarded as an immutable requirement for higher liberal education, is the course in dentistry of necessity of the same length? Is it in accordance with a law of nature or merely by the accident of tradition that the same period of time should be demanded of neophytes in business, agriculture, a dozen different kinds of engineering, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine? There are many of us who believe that a reëxamination of professional and higher vocational training, with fresh reference to the demands of the several callings, would lead to some startling conclusions concerning the time element in such training. Indeed a review—I believe a periodic review—of the administrative organization of the higher educational system is imperatively demanded. Effective articulation between training and professional requirements demands it. The rising cost of education, the growing difficulty of financing it on any terms emphasizes the necessity.

"Another large problem which is national in scope and affects the membership of practically every association of higher institutions is the illogical distribution of establishments for expensive professional training. There is a large surplusage of schools and departments devoted to certain kinds of professional education. There is an equally serious shortage of facilities for training in other professions. Moreover, expensive professional training facilities are concentrated in a few regions. Competition between the institutions offering these facilities is unavoidable. At the same time the limits of the field of university education are constantly expanding. All universities are called upon to furnish more different kinds of training than they can afford to maintain. It is patent that before long each of our higher educational establishments, even the richest, will have to select a relatively small number of branches in which it will offer professional education. Each will have to specialize and the directions in which each is to specialize should be determined by its location, its equipment, and by the demands of its constituency. If gradually and by joint agreement the distribution of schools for higher professional training could be arranged in accordance with a systematic plan, the interests of the country would be greatly served.

"I have mentioned these matters by way of illustration, not with the thought that they represent an exhaustive catalogue. They are typical of the many problems of large policy in the domain of higher education. Some demand immediate solution. Some are more remote. All emphasize again the familiar fact that the development of the American educational scheme has been planless, haphazard. We have always suffered because of this planlessness. The price that we are called upon to pay for our lack of forethought and the consequent lack of system becomes heavier year by year. Unified action has always been impossible because there was no unifying agency. There has been no means even to create a consensus of opinion. A unifying agency has now at last been established. To stimulate discussion, to focus opinion, and in the end to bring about joint action on major matters of higher educational policy—these are the things that the American Council on Education was created to do. Supported as it is, it must naturally begin modestly. But

its primary purpose should always be kept before the eyes of its members and of the general public. As its resources increase it should turn them to the accomplishment of that purpose. This is the justification for the Council's existence, or there is none."

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—The annual meeting of the Trustees was held at Columbia University, October 24. The following officers were elected: Chairman, H. P. Judson (Chicago); Vice-Chairman, J. G. Hibben (Princeton); Secretary, J. W. Cunliffe (Columbia); Treasurer, Henry B. Thompson (Princeton). These with A. L. Lowell (Harvard), W. A. Shanklin (Wesleyan), and A. P. Stokes (Yale) constitute the Administrative Board.

The following gentlemen have accepted the invitation of the Board of Trustees to become patrons of the Union:

W. G. Harding, President of the United States
Alexandre Millerand, President of the French Republic
Brand Whitlock, U.S. Ambassador to Belgium
George Harvey, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain
Richard Washburn Child, U.S. Ambassador to Italy
Robert U. Johnson, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy
Baron de Cartier de Marchienne, Belgian Ambassador, Washington

J. J. Jusserand, French Ambassador, Washington
Rolando Ricci, Italian Ambassador, Washington
J. Destrée, Minister of Education, Brussels
H. A. L. Fisher, President Board of Education, London
Viscount Bryce

The annual report of the Director of the London office showed an increase in registration from 638 in 1920 to 1,153 in 1920-21. The number of applications from teachers and students for posts or exchange was 228 as against 129 for the previous year. The registration in the Paris office for the year 1920-21 has been almost double that of the preceding year, having reached a total well over five hundred in French universities, coming from 103 American institutions of learning; this is in addition to a large number studying in the Beaux Arts and other institutions not directly connected with the French universities.

With a view to the closer coordination of American activities in international education, it was agreed that the office of the Institute of International Education in New York shall be accepted as the center and clearing house for dealing with general questions of international education. The Union offices in London and Paris shall be respectively the British and French centers and clearing houses for questions of international education in which American interests are involved, arising in those countries. The Directors of these offices shall be appointed by the Union after consultation with the Director of the Institute. A Committee is to be formed to be known as the American Committee on International Education, consisting of the Director of the American Council on Education, the Director of the Institute of International Education, the Secretary of the American University Union and the American representative of the International Federation of University Women. It is hoped that this plan will lead to more efficient conduct of the business of the interchange of teachers and students and other arrangements in connection with international educational movements.

EDUCATIONAL BOARDS AND FOUNDATIONS.—Bulletin No. 17, 1921, of the United States Bureau of Education, reviews the activities from July, 1918, to June, 1920, of the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, and the John F. Slater Foundation.

AMERICAN FIELD SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS FOR FRENCH UNIVERSITIES.—The Trustees announce twenty-five Fellowships for open competition among graduates of American colleges and other suitably qualified candidates who wish to engage in advanced study and research in French universities during 1922-23. Detailed information may be obtained from the Secretary, Dr. I. L. Kandel, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

The Council for 1921 has held one meeting in connection with the Seventh Annual Meeting at Chicago, and has conducted business during the year by correspondence.

An important meeting of the Executive Committee, to which other members of the Council and chairmen of the principal committees were invited, was held in New York, May 21st. It will probably be increasingly important to hold such a meeting early in each year for the discussion of plans and policies more fully than is possible at the close of the annual meeting.

The Council has given particular attention to suggestions and criticism in regard to the conduct of annual meetings and to the increased development of local branch activity. It is apparent from recent experience that a large representative meeting, such as marked the organization of the Association, is not likely to be achieved in December in view of prior interests of members and difficult conditions of travel. The possible alternative of such a large meeting in the summer will come up for discussion in the annual meeting. The Council has authorized the officers to arrange for partial reimbursement of traveling expenses, if necessary, for members of the Council attending the annual meeting or a special meeting, but the officers have not yet thought it wise to exercise this authority except for defraying the expenses of persons attending the May conference in New York, amounting to about \$300.

Committee G—Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates—has been reorganized under the chairmanship of E. H. Wilkins, University of Chicago, and a new Committee D—Relation between General and Vocational Education—has been constituted under the chairmanship of Lucile Eaves, Simmons College; also Committee K—Systems for Sabbatical Years—under the chairmanship of Joseph Jastrow, University of Wisconsin.

The Council has also appointed a special committee to increase the circulation of the BULLETIN among libraries, under the chairmanship of T. W. Koch of Northwestern University, and the committee has been making an active canvass.

Four members have been transferred to the honorary list. The growth of the Association during the year has been well maintained and the year will end with a substantial and gratifying surplus.

Other business transacted by the Council during the year has been reported in successive numbers of the BULLETIN and is therefore not reviewed in detail.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

The work of the Secretary's office has included the conduct of Council business, general correspondence with officers of local branches, chairmen of committees and other members, and the publication of the BULLETIN.

No special campaign for new members has been initiated during the year, but the effort of 1921 has continued to bear fruit, as indicated by the following statistics:

January 1, 1921:

Active members	3,632
Honorary members	57

January 1 to November 30, 1921:

Elected to membership	464
Resignation	35
Deaths	5
Transfers to honorary list	4
Deaths of honorary members	3

November 30, 1921:

Active members	4,052
Honorary members	58
Gain in active membership during the year	420

The Association has members at 174 institutions.

BULLETIN.—As the present BULLETIN completes Volume VII, it may be of interest to review the development of the publication from its beginning (in its present form) in 1916. Prior to that time the Association had published two BULLETINS without serial number, containing the annual address of President Dewey, a general report on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and a report on conditions at the University of Utah. The plan for a monthly BULLETIN was due to President Wigmore and was put into effect by the present Secretary with the issue of Volume II, Number 1, in March, 1916. Since that time there have been monthly issues except during the four summer months, and occasionally second parts containing reports of Academic Freedom investigations.

The amount of publication is shown by the following statistics of the number of pages, figures in parentheses denoting space occupied by reports of Academic Freedom investigations:

1916.....	366	(133)	1919.....	446	(118)
1917.....	415	(188)	1920.....	281	(21)
1918.....	190	(31)	1921.....	375	(81)

For several years the BULLETIN has contained a division on RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION which has aimed to make matters of general interest more accessible to our membership than they otherwise would be. In carrying out this plan the Secretary has received substantial cooperation from F. N. Scott of the University of Michigan, S. P. Sherman of the University of Illinois, and A. L. Wheeler of Bryn Mawr.

NOTES FROM COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE B (METHODS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION).—The committee, under the chairmanship of T. H. Morgan, Columbia, has been making a study of the proposals from the local branches of Smith College (May BULLETIN) and the University of Chicago (October BULLETIN), and the chairman has conferred with the Director of the American Council on Education in regard to the possibility of establishing a central appointment personnel office. A preliminary report will be presented at the annual meeting and possibly circulated to local branches in advance.

COMMITTEE G (METHODS OF INCREASING INTELLECTUAL INTEREST OF UNDERGRADUATES).—At the instance of the chairman, cooperating local committees have been appointed by a number of local branches. Further appointments are desirable and should prove stimulating for local branch discussion. Correspondence with the chairman, E. H. Wilkins, University of Chicago, in regard to this is invited.

Particular attention is called to the report from the Minnesota local branch dealing with this general subject. The committee is actively engaged in studying various methods for improving the conditions there stated.

NOTES FROM LOCAL BRANCHES

OFFICERS ELECTED.—

Columbia University: Chairman, W. W. Cook; Secretary, Margaret E. Maltbie.

University of Missouri: Chairman, George Lefevre; Vice-Chairman, Max F. Meyer; Secretary, Jonas Viles.

The State College of Washington: Chairman, A. L. Melander; Vice-Chairman, F. J. Sievers; Treasurer, E. F. Gaines; Secretary, F. D. Heald.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.—The local branch sends in the following outline which served as a basis for a recent meeting.

A PLAN TO INCREASE INTEREST IN SCHOLARSHIP AND TO INDUCE ATTENTION TO STUDIES ON THE PART OF A LARGER NUMBER OF STUDENTS

I. The Present Situation.

1. Failure of honors, prizes, honor courses, and the like to produce this result.
2. Lack of sufficient stimulus or incentive in the present requirements for a degree.
 - a. The requirements are adapted to the poorest passable student; i.e., we have a system of minimum requirements with no recognition of higher attainments or "overpay for additional product."
 - b. Requirements are based on time spent rather than on attainments.
 - c. The more capable or brilliant students, being able to do the required work in a fraction of the time allowed, find nothing to challenge their powers.
3. The time and energy given to extra-curricular activities is having a demoralizing influence in university life. Many of the most capable young men and women are spending an undue amount of their time in this way, who should be induced to direct their energies to things of real and permanent value.

II. *Objects to be Gained.*

1. To interest a larger number of students to put their best efforts into their studies; incidentally to reduce the relative prominence and influence of extra-curricular activities and amusements.
2. To make the securing of a degree dependent upon certain attainment rather than the expenditure of certain time, and to attempt to standardize the attainment for students of varying degrees of ability.

III. *Assumptions.*

1. Inducement to a change of habit of mind is to be found in some appeal to the individual interest.
2. The atmosphere of the college would be immensely improved if a considerable group of students—in addition to any who now do so—were to concentrate their energies vigorously on their studies.
3. Students who secure marks of A or B thereby give evidence of attainment higher in quantity as well as quality than that of students whose marks are C or D.
4. It is possible to form an hypothetical estimate of this quantitative and qualitative difference and it will be good policy to reward the higher attainment if by so doing the unconscious effort can be induced.

IV. *Plan Suggested.*

1. Credit related to quality of work.

The mechanical details of this plan are based on the general assumption that A work during three years represents as great or satisfactory attainment intellectually and in character foundation as C work during four years.

a. The present requirements of 180 credits and 180 honor points may remain the standard and four years may be regarded as the normal period for securing the Bachelor's degree.

b. Announcements should be made and students' records kept in the same terms as at present (hours of lectures, laboratory or recitation, credits, etc.).

c. In the registrar's office each student's credits will be evaluated in reference to the marks received according to the following scheme:

<i>Marks</i>	<i>Credits toward Graduation</i>
D	Ten per cent. off the credit hours in the course
C	Par (same as the credit hours in the course)
B	Ten per cent. added to the credit hours in the course
A	Twenty per cent. added to the credit hours in the course

d. In applying the regulations for promotion from the junior to the senior college, the credits shall be evaluated as above indicated.

e. A student whose credits toward graduation are above par may enter upon the major and minor studies as soon as the prerequisites have been taken, provided the group requirements have not been postponed.

2. Credit hours allowed in proportion to the student's ability and willingness to work.

a. The average grades received in one quarter or in two consecutive quarters will determine the number of hours that may be elected in the following quarter. A student who gains the privilege of electing a number of hours above the normal may continue that schedule so long as he maintains his high standing.

b. Students will be limited in their elections in accordance with the following scheme:

<i>Average Grades</i>	<i>Hours limited to</i>
D to C	15, 13, 10 (at the discretion of the Students' Work Committee)
C	13 to 17 hours
C + (1.50 H.P.*)	17 hours
B (2.00 H.P.)	18 hours
B + (2.50 H.P.)	21 hours

*Honor Points.

c. Elections each quarter must provide for normal progress in the requirements of the student's course and in the sequence of major and minor studies.

NEW LOCAL BRANCHES.—Additional local branches have been organized at nine institutions. Much additional work remains to be done in this direction, also in maintaining the activity of existing branches.

STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR LOCAL BRANCHES

The following statement has been recently prepared to explain the need and the functions of local branches:

The Association now has over 4,000 members with 70 local branches in as many institutions. There are, however, a number of colleges and universities with more than the necessary seven members where for various reasons no local branch has been maintained. Since the successful activity of the Association and its committees necessarily depends on the cooperation of local branches and is likely to depend on it more and more with the development of the referendum procedure, it is important that local branches be organized in these colleges and universities. The adoption of a pending amendment to the constitution would indeed impose upon the officers the duty of appointing local branch officers in institutions where no initiative is taken,—a responsibility which the officers would certainly be glad not to incur.

It is of course appreciated that in most institutions the pressure of committee work and society meetings is severe and that local branch organization can only be justified by definite and cogent reasons. These may be stated as follows:

Local Problems.—The profession as a whole, as distinguished from national societies for particular subjects, has common interests and problems with which the Association is organized to deal, in part through committees, in part through the annual meeting and the *BULLETIN*, but in the end the local problems can be dealt with only by men in the institution concerned. If they recognize that they have common interests, they should be willing to make the moderate sacrifice of time and effort which simple local branch organization involves.

Annual Meeting.—The annual meeting, on account of geographical difficulties and conflicting engagements, will rarely be broadly representative except on the delegate basis. One im-

portant service which a local branch can render the Association consists, therefore, in sending a delegate to the meeting. Without such representation the local members are practically disfranchised and are not doing their part to promote the objects of the Association.

Business during the Year.—The Council and the committees of the Association aim to present important questions of general interest for local branches during the year. The discussion of these questions at local branch meetings should be of special value to the branches themselves and particularly to junior members. The results of such discussion when transmitted to the general officers or to the chairmen of committees form the best possible basis for ascertaining and expressing the consensus of professional opinion.

It may be added that while the active membership in the Association is restricted to those engaged in teaching or research with three years' previous service, it is entirely competent for any local branch to invite junior teachers or executive officers to its meetings.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT.*—"I have read the paper you sent on the place and functions of faculties in university government and administration. On the whole I am unfavorably impressed by it. It does not seem to me to be the strong, exhaustive, balanced treatment that such a body as the Association of University Professors should lay before us after years of organized effort. It is far from showing a masterly grip on the essential features of university management. It is lacking in that equipoise and at the same time keen discrimination which might have been expected, for these qualities are the best possible credentials of fitness to participate in so delicate and difficult work as institutional administration.

"The faults of trustees seem to be well realized, and forcibly set forth. There is silence on their virtues, and yet I think they have some virtues that might be recognized. Education is not so much a thing of the schoolroom as of the lives of men and women. The trustees, as men of affairs and of large experience in the realities of life, are likely to be quite as good judges of what is of real worth in life as those who dwell more largely in the classic shades.

"The soul of the problem of administration centers in ability to lead educational institutions into lines of effort productive of the greatest practical usefulness in the broadest and best sense of the term. Those who are interested enough to vote taxes upon themselves or to give gifts to promote this, form estimates of the values of education from points of view that have some distinct advantages over the point of view of those who are doing the technical work according to some inherited pattern. And this advantageous point of view should be fully recognized and adequately weighed, while urging the advantages of the other point of view. The report, in not recognizing this, is distinctly weak.

*Dr. Melvin A. Brannon, President of Beloit College, submitted the report of the Committee on the Place and Function of the Faculties in University Administration to Dr. Thomas C. Chamberlain, Professor Emeritus of the University of Chicago, Trustee of Beloit College, and formerly President of the University of Wisconsin. Professor Chamberlain's reply is reprinted herewith from *School and Society*.

"It is my judgment, based on rather large experience and observation, that our universities owe more of the advances they have achieved during the past half-century to the joint work of their trustees and presidents than to the influence of the faculties. This is not so much because of inherent ability or virtue, as of contact with the world that needs education, is calling for it, is praying for it, and is not satisfied with what it has been getting in return. The world's desires and demands are rather vague and blind, to be sure, and more or less in error, but there is ground for its dissatisfaction.

"I have been a rather active participant in the struggle to secure a more open, equable place in our higher institutions for one of the lines of education demanded, that of science—a demand now being better met—and in this struggle have found that obstacles sprang much more largely from the 'vested interests' of the old curricula within the faculties than from trustees, or presidents, or the public. This is altogether natural, typical, and representative. There is always, and probably always will be, greater need for the development of existing lines of effort in any institution than can be adequately met by its financial resources. Those who are in charge of these lines of effort, those whose main interests are wrapped up in them, are naturally prone to regard the further development of these as being more important than the introduction of new lines. More than this, it is usually felt by the faculties that the existing lines of effort are of higher intrinsic value than the proposed new lines. Consistency almost requires this. Otherwise the faculties would implicitly confess that they have been pursuing inferior lines of effort. It is too much to expect this. In general, it is true that the old and tried lines are better *developed* than any new lines. In general the new lines are less deployed, less mature, less well organized than the old lines. As a result of all this, faculties, as a rule, are strongly biased in favor of what is being done, as against what it is proposed to do. They can make a strong argument in favor of doing well and thoroughly what is already being attempted, as against branching out into new fields. This attitude becomes peculiarly strong when the choice lies between the further development of their own loved lines of effort and new lines in the hands of new men against whose culture, attitudes, and urgencies, more or less of prejudice or poor opinion is entertained.

"So far, then, as concerns branching out into new fields or developing new departments, the influence of faculties which the institutions have inherited, as a matter of history and almost as a matter of the inevitable, not only is conservative but tends to be antagonistic. This is occultly revealed in the report, but it is marshalled under terms of 'quality *versus* quantity,' as is usually done when the real issue lies between the old and the new. We have all heard from the days of yore that the classics are very much superior to the sciences in intellectual and moral qualities. Their 'superior quality' has been the great club that has made our heads sore for the last half-century.

"The parties to this form of the educational business are (1) the public, in the form of taxpayers, donors, parents, and employers of university talent, the makers of the market for graduates; (2) the trustees, who represent these prime movers in the business and who are its underwriters; (3) the students, the immediate beneficiaries, or (*pace!* my dear president!) the immediate victims; and (4) the faculties, the technicians who do the skilled work in the educational shop. I have always felt that party No. 3—not mentioned in the report, I think—was really the party of the first part, and most likely to mold the judgment of the next generation. Party No. 4 knows the shop technique much the best, but still there remains the question whether it is best fitted to manage the business.

"Aside from that, there are practical considerations of a serious sort in faculty representation on boards of trustees. In the first place, the president is presumed to represent the faculty. By virtue of his membership in all the faculties and his relations to all, he is under obligations to do this fairly and justly. He is human, of course, but he is least likely, because of his point of view, and of the ethics of his office, to overstress sectional or factional opinions entertained in the faculty. To appoint some other member of the faculty to this function carries with it the intimation that the president is either not wholly competent nor wholly unbiased in his representation of faculty views and interests. More than this, faculties are by no means units, and any single choice gives preference to one section rather than another. A professor engrossed in a given part of the work is not more likely, either because of his part in the work or by reason of moral obligation, to be an equable and equitable repre-

sentative of the faculty than the president. This difficulty could not be altogether avoided by the appointment of more than one professor to membership on the board, for even if this were free from other objections, three, four, or more would not represent all sections of a large university. The unrepresented sections would doubtless feel less satisfied than now—at least after a little experience.

"The most serious difficulty in university administration is practically ignored in the report and a serious embarrassment added to the personal difficulties. I refer, of course, to the formidable task of weeding out incompetency and bringing to the highest practicable efficiency the entire work of the institution. It is beyond the power of human discernment to avoid errors in the selection of the men of the staff, and if they have become settled in their places, the problem of their replacement is one of the gravest which an administration has to face. Now the committee, in its recommendation, erects a barrier of a very formidable sort in the way of such replacement, when needed, by specifying, without reserve, that the president should *in all cases* act with the representatives of the departments in the matter of appointments, promotions, etc. It may easily be—and often is—the representative of the department that himself constitutes the problem. The president is therefore handicapped if he must consult the wishes of the delinquent party. The most troublesome cases are those of merely mediocre efficiency—those 'too good to dismiss and too poor to keep.' Such men almost instinctively fear strong, pushing associates and throw their influence in favor of those who will not overshadow or disturb them in their own positions. A weak head prefers a complacent, commonplace associate, and so, if his voice is heard in the appointment, the weakness is handed on.

"But I am making this letter too long, and yet it is necessarily unsatisfactory because the qualifications that are needed to make it broader and more balanced, are necessarily left out. It represents only some of my more outstanding reactions in reading the report of the committee of university professors. The very difficulties they had in formulating their report, as set forth by their chairman, show the inherent difficulty of marshalling and organizing such a body as a faculty into a definite unit, with clear

and steady purpose, such as is required for efficient administration.

"That there should be free interchange of ideas between faculties and trustees goes without saying. It has been practised more or less ever since I came to know anything of the matter, but might be practised more to advantage, for the way is open. As a member of the faculty at Beloit, forty years or more ago, I remember to have gone before the board of trustees in the advocacy of certain measures of general policy. I remember also to have worked as a member of a faculty committee, with a trustee committee, on a matter of general policy. Such practices I think have been the order of the day all along. I think they could be made about as frequent as the faculty desire. The results of actual trial would be the best basis for anything further that may be found wise.

"There is another subject, not obviously allied with this, but yet bearing on it, of which I am minded to speak. In some respects it offers a partial remedy for the feeling of aloofness and non-participation which members of the faculty more or less entertain. It is customary, in the larger faculties at least, to make use of parliamentary rules in the conduct of business, and in simple routine business this is no doubt best. But these rules are made to meet the requirements of opposing parties, sharp battlings of adverse factions, the issues between the 'outs' and the 'ins.' They are formed to force an issue if necessary. They imply *contest* rather than *conference*.

"To avoid making a university issue a matter of contest for or against a given motion, I devised, while at Madison, another method of conducting faculty business, when *important questions* were up for consideration. This gave to every member of the faculty the opportunity of presenting precisely the proposition that he thought would best meet the issue in hand, and of *having it voted upon just as he framed it*. It gave him *individuality*. He was not forced to vote on an issue neither side of which quite suited him, at least not until he had recorded just where he stood and was prepared to make concessions to the views of the majority. We called it the 'differential vote.' It was preliminary to final action.

"When a subject of importance was before the faculty and diversity of opinion developed, the preliminary procedure took the form of framing propositions by faculty members each after his own mind, between which choice was to be made. As many such propositions were invited as members of the faculty chose to submit, the fundamental understanding being that enough propositions would be submitted to represent all shades of view. When all who desired had submitted propositions and explained them, and no further discussions or questions were offered, and these propositions had been numbered and re-read, so that they were precisely understood, the members of the faculty proceeded to record their preferences by a series of differential votes. After the first vote, which of course showed first preferences, the proposition (or propositions) which received the lowest number of votes was dropped out, and a second vote was taken on the remainder. The proposition (or propositions) having the least votes on this ballot was then dropped out and the voting proceeded until preferences were concentrated on the most acceptable proposition. All this was informal. The faculty then proceeded to formal action, either by the adoption of the preferred proposition or some modification of it that seemed better fitted to meet the views of all, as nearly as this could be. Usually the majority was ready to make concessions to the minority, after its own dominance was assured and it understood precisely the views of those who differed from it.

"At first thought, it may seem that this would be troublesome and tedious, but as a matter of fact, so far as our experience went, it took less time to go thus straight home to constructive work on the real issue than to fight over some particular proposition that was being forced by the usual parliamentary method. The plan saved wastage of time in battling other people's opinions and directed effort into constructive lines; little time was squandered in destructive arguments, and irritation was avoided. Furthermore there was a fine moral effect; every member of the faculty felt that he could have his views, guarded and shaded just as he wanted them to be, as fairly considered as any other views. When so considered, he felt the more willing to acquiesce in the majority judgment of his colleagues.

"This method carries the atmosphere of a president's cabinet, where wise men freely confer and compare opinion, and then decide, rather than that of a congress where men fight and force issues.

"Of course, in the transaction of ordinary routine business it is not important to use this method. It is only with questions of importance on which notable divergence of opinion arises, that it has its special value.

"This has come back to mind in the present connection merely because the method tends to make the faculty a constituent part of the administration in the form of a cabinet of advisers to the chief executive. This I think is really worth more to them than a vote or two on behalf of one of the four parties. It gives the members of the faculty a feeling of greater individual participation in the management of affairs than is likely to come to them through representation as party of the fourth part."

COMMENT ON PROFESSOR CHAMBERLAIN'S LETTER BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE T.—

"1. The writer seems to have misconstrued, in certain important respects, the scope and purport of the report in question. The report was prepared under difficult conditions. During the period of its incubation the Committee was handicapped by the distractions incidental to the relations of the United States to the Great War. Many of its members were actively engaged in various sorts of home service. Under normal circumstances the wide geographical distribution of the members of such a committee would be a serious handicap and the actual circumstances were abnormal. It seemed best not to attempt completeness and finality, but rather to indicate briefly some of the main problems and standpoints and to suggest various ways of meeting the problems. The report distinctly purports to offer only a basis for further discussion. My own view is that it would be undesirable for a committee of this kind to attempt to formulate now a complete and water-tight scheme of faculty participation in university administration. Conditions are too various and things are too much in flux in the field of higher education. It is desirable that experiments should be made with various plans of faculty participation.

"2. The report is not in any sense a dissertation on the faults and virtues of trustees, presidents, or faculties. I regard Professor Chamberlain's remark that the report is silent on the virtues of trustees as wholly irrelevant to the aim of the report.

"3. The statement is made in connection with the contention that faculties tend to be antagonistic to the development of new fields of higher education, especially in science, that—"This is occultly revealed in the report, but it is marshalled under terms of "quality *versus* quantity," as is usually done when the real issue lies between the old and the new.' This is a misinterpretation of that part of the report, which I wrote. I do not believe that any member of our committee is hostile to the development of new fields of education and research in science or elsewhere. Certainly I am not. What I had in mind was the fact that large numbers of students are coming to the Universities with certificates of graduation from high schools without adequate preparation or serious purpose. Ten years' service on the Executive Committee of the College of Arts of my own university has convinced me that this statement is not an exaggeration. Frequent exchange of ideas with colleagues in other institutions has convinced me that my own university is not peculiar in this respect. The almost indiscriminate admission of preparatory school graduates involves a considerable waste of time, energy, and money. What the remedy may be is another question.

"4. Professor Chamberlain says that the fourth party to the educational business consists of the faculties,—"The technicians who do the skilled work in the educational shop.' He seems to question the competency of party No. 4 to participate in the management of the business. I think it is unfortunately true that a good many faculty members do function almost entirely as shop technicians. This, I suppose, is a consequence of the excessive departmentalization into which we have run. Departments are necessary. Nevertheless I regard it as disastrous when members of faculties neither attempt to nor are given incentive to think, debate, and act effectively on broad questions of educational polity and philosophy. It seems to me a *university professor*, in distinction from a mere pedagogical technician, should esteem it one of his most precious privileges and paramount duties to think out problems of educational polity.

"5. Professor Chamberlain's account of the method devised by him while at Madison for conducting faculty business is very interesting and suggestive. I very much doubt whether it would work satisfactorily in a faculty with three or four hundred voting members. In large faculties it seems to me much better that smaller executive committees and special committees *ad hoc* should work out plans for dealing with important matters and that their reports should be submitted in print a reasonable time before these reports come up for action.

"6. I am skeptical in regard to faculty membership on Boards of Trustees. It seems to me to involve confusion of functions. But I am strongly of the opinion that, in our larger and more complex universities, it is desirable, when important questions of policy come up, that they should be settled after conference between committees representing the faculties and the trustees. I could cite from my own experience a number of instances in which this method has ironed out difficulties and avoided misunderstandings. Certainly a president's hands are strengthened if the trustees know that he has the faculty with him in a matter of policy.

"7. Professor Chamberlain is right in saying that the task of weeding out incompetency is a serious difficulty in university administration. It is unfortunately true that many faculty members pursue a *laissez faire* policy in such matters. If the faculties are unwilling to shoulder their share of responsibility in such matters they have no business to ask for a part in administration. It was not the intention of our committee to erect a barrier against action in this difficult matter. It dealt only with procedure in appointments and promotions, on the assumption that to formulate procedure in removals was part of the business of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The latter committee has already formulated some principles on this matter and will doubtless make further recommendations. In fact I have accepted membership on the latter committee with special reference to procedure in dismissals.

"8. Professor Chamberlain is undoubtedly right in saying that Trustees, as representatives of the public which supports higher education, 'are likely to be quite as good judges of what is of real worth in life as those who dwell more largely in the classic

shades.' For this reason I contend that there should be frequent opportunity for interchange of views between trustees and faculties. The ideal way would be for the entire board of trustees to meet the entire Faculty and discuss with it questions of educational policy. Since this does not seem to be practicable, owing to the fact that most trustees are non-residents and very busy men, and that faculties are very large in our great universities, is it not desirable that chosen representatives of faculties should discuss such matters with the trustees? I doubt whether presidents are, as a rule, capable of invariably conveying adequately to the trustees the prevailing views of the faculty and of invariably conveying adequately to the Faculty the views of the trustees."—*J. A. Leighton.*

UNIVERSITY MORALE.—"If members of the governing board use the university corruptly for personal or political gain, if they are dishonest in institutional contracts, if they try to control book adoptions, if they interfere unjustly in the discipline of students so that there is one law for those who have influence and another for those who have not, if they allow churches, or parties, or powerful men to influence faculty appointments and dismissals, if they suppress the freedom of teaching, if in any way they discourage the finest things for which the university exists and encourage the things existing in it which are not so fine, then that university must grow sick. Money will not cure this sickness. More money will make it worse. One hears that all these and other such sins are from time to time committed by governing boards of the universities and colleges including the church colleges. The most scorching denunciation of the dishonesties of a college board which I have ever heard came from a fine old minister who was heartbroken by the doings within the board of his own church college.

"On the other hand, my belief is, that such wrongful acts as I have named are relatively rare. Nearly all the trustees whom I have known or known about, have given a service to their institutions which was most unselfish and high-minded. . . . In this connection I recall the observation of President Mees that no man is fit to be a college professor until he has been a college president. . . . In the house of the Interpreter a man in

an iron cage, who was doubtless a college president, says: 'Once I was a fair professor but now, alas, I am confined in this iron cage.' . . . When a professor, especially one who has kept out of most troubles, except those within his science, is tempted into the presidency, he is likely to discover within himself a hitherto unknown man. He takes the alluring chair with his own noble inaugural still sounding in his ears and there across the desk is a man with a demand. A few minutes later there is another man with another demand. And so on, hour after hour. Every sort of man—high-minded gentleman, greedy, truculent grafter. Every sort of proposal from graft, brazen or subtly concealed, up to the noblest counsel of gentlemen. The erstwhile professor must then and there judge. With whatever common sense, with whatever science, with whatever inspiration from his inaugural or elsewhere, he must decide *what to do* on issues ranging from the coal contract to the constitution of the university curriculum. His ideas must become *idées forcées*. His thinking must become will. Every joint in his harness is tried as it would not be tried on the battlefield. Every weakness will come out. Indecision, cowardice, egotism, selfishness, falsehood, including insincere and deceptive tact—every fault will come out in his decisions, as surely as the faults of a beam come out when it is twisted and crushed in an engineering laboratory. It is no wonder that some presidents are twisted and crushed and presently thrown aside. . . .

"One fact which affects the situation is, that a professor may descend well toward the bottom of the curve in industry, efficiency, and even in important moral qualities, without losing his place. A former president of the Association of University Professors defended this special privilege to me as follows: Judges of the court, said he, are exempt from arrest. This is best on the whole for the administration of justice, even though some bad men profit unjustly by the exemption. In like manner, said he, it is best on the whole that professors should hold their places free of peril and free of the fear of peril even though some individuals take wrongful advantage of this special privilege. I shall not contest this view. I recognize its force. But I would make two remarks: first, it is not the president and board of trustees who suffer by the retention of a bad, incompetent or lazy

professor. It is the students who suffer—they for whom the university chiefly exists. I have known the generations of students through twenty-five years to be sacrificed so that a goodish, weak man should be taken care of.

"... William James laments Harvard's failure to take in Thomas Davidson. Davidson was a great scholar, a great genius, a noble spirit with a terrible habit of saying what he thought. He did not fit in. No university took him in. James thought, and I agree, that this was the worse for the universities. William Dean Howells was offered professorships in Harvard, Yale, and Hopkins. He declined all these offers. He said he had no idea what a professor had to do. What a fine thing if he had been invited by some university to do nothing at all except to be in residence and to get acquainted with the advanced students and professors of literature. This would have been a service of inestimable value if only to counteract the deadly doctor-thesis knowledge *about* literature with some glimpse of literature as it is conceived by an artist. I hear that Miami University has invited an artist of distinction to be in residence there this year. Within the coming decade we shall, I believe, have not only a considerable number of research professors, as at present, but also corresponding numbers of men from the great arts with no formal duties and only the duty of bringing the spirit of art within the university. Jordan used to say that the university must be made habitable by scholars. We must do a harder thing. We must make the university habitable by artists. . . .

"Finally, whoever tries to develop high morale in the university must face the fact that neither our universities nor our world of 1920 has a consensus of faith which we can swear by and follow, such as medieval Europe had. Thomas Aquinas; better than anyone else, systematized the medieval consensus and told the universities exactly what to believe and teach on all the concerns of mankind in time and eternity. Such an agreed upon creed and program solidifies society. It develops a close knit almost military morale. . . ."—*W. L. Bryan, University of Indiana, Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities.*

GOVERNMENT OF UNIVERSITIES.—“An intelligent and beneficent autocracy is an efficient form of government and satisfactory to all who do not look ahead to the possibility of the succession of an autocrat who is stupid or cruel or selfishly ambitious.

“The only advantage of the McGill constitution over the worst type of organization found in the United States is the opportunity afforded the Governors of meeting with a few representatives of the Faculties in the cumbersome Corporation, a body of about sixty-five members, meeting five times a year. The authority of the Board of Governors has recently been displayed in the appointment of a Principal who had never previously been a member of any university. A man who has evolved in a few years from a real estate agent into one of the most successful generals in the greatest war of history may possibly be capable of a second miracle of metamorphosis. But the chances are wide and I imagine that had the Faculties had the right of choosing their own head, or even of sharing in the responsibility for the choice, a more conservative policy would have been followed.

“The older and more commendable form of organization is the American Association of University Professors, which was organized in January, 1915. Its supporters object to the principle of affiliation with labor organizations on the ground that such affiliation constitutes a subscription to the view that teachers are to be regarded as mere employees, that such affiliation commits teachers to the policy of going on strike, either in defence of their own rights or in sympathy with other affiliated unions, and that it interferes with the independent and unprejudiced study of economic questions, particularly on the part of those in the departments of social science whose duty it is to study such questions impartially.”—*Extract from article by J. F. Snell, Macdonald College, Quebec.*

MATRICULATION ADDRESS AT YALE UNIVERSITY.—“...Modern society has been for seven years undergoing the most tremendous indictment which it has ever sustained, and whether it is to survive in its previous forms, is to be materially modified, or is to go the way of the civilizations of antiquity is still uncertain. The indictment has been ostensibly directed against its political

and economic organization, but essentially it is an assault upon the moral and religious fabric of the social order. If capitalism, for example, is the evil thing often alleged, it is evil primarily because men do not conceive themselves as members one of another. If monarchical absolutism is an evil, it is so in the first instance because men possessing the supreme power regard themselves and their interests as wholly superior to the rank and file of mankind. If democratic forms of government have failed wholly to secure that increase of human happiness and justice which has often been so confidently predicted for them, it is in part at least because no form of government merely as such can protect against the malfeasance of men whose purposes are sinister and selfish. The university community is in exactly the same case. No matter how intelligent its organization, how ingenious its devices, how generous its resources in men and materials, it cannot attain to its full usefulness unless every member of it is earnestly and unselfishly devoted to the execution of his own particular part of the general task. . . .

"Yet we owe far more than loyalty in the ordinary meaning of this term. Modern society is calling as never before in our lifetime for leadership, for men with vision and character, with trained intelligence, with hope and confidence in the finer humanity that is to come. And where shall such men be sought, where shall they be bred, if not in our colleges and universities where are gathered all that history, and civilization and science, and art have to teach us of God and man and nature? The social order has been shaken to its very foundation the world over and particularly in Eastern and Central Europe. Stability and sobriety and reason will only slowly assert themselves again as a generation trained to honest thinking and courageous endeavor once more comes into command.

"To the young student just entering upon his college course there is offered as literally never before an opportunity to train himself to play a crucial part in the world's work. Social and political ideals are in ferment, moral and religious traditions are under unprecedented strain, commercial and industrial relations are experiencing almost revolutionary changes and more is to follow. Surely never has the call for independent thinking and courageous initiative been so loud and so insistent. To

meet it successfully one must bring youth and vigor and a disciplined mind, with solid, well-formed character. These are gifts that the university can give to those who earnestly seek and sincerely strive to achieve. To the sluggard and the loafer she nor any other university can give these powers which come only by self-exertion. As well hope to gain powerful muscles by idleness and inactivity as to secure mental grasp and intellectual strength by mental sloth and trifling intermittent effort.

"Equally compelling is the obligation and equally inspiring the opportunity for those of us who compose the faculties. To no generation of college teachers was ever given such opportunity to train and send out men fitted to cope with a great human emergency. To no generation of youth has the world offered such prospect for service and mastery. The colleges are besieged by young men in numbers never before known. If we cannot kindle in them the fires of intellectual interest, cannot inspire them with high ideals and the hungry desire to do an able man's part in the world, cannot train them to render the many services so sadly needed by mankind today, our failure is tragic indeed. Moreover, on us and on others like us devolves the parallel obligation to push forward the boundaries of human knowledge. Many of the ills of humanity can be cured, if at all, only by attaining new insight, by securing new methods of procedure, by gaining new tools, and these contributions must be the work of scholars and scientists and soldiers of Christ the world over. Nor is there any range of learning exempt from this obligation. With our great libraries, our splendid laboratories, our trained intelligences, we are justly expected to contribute to the forward march of humanity by new discoveries and new adjustments of man to man, and man to nature. If we do not succeed, we shall have failed to return to society the investment made in us."—*J. R. Angell, School and Society.*

OCCUPATIONAL DESCRIPTION OF OUR FACULTY POSITIONS.—" . . . There is a very great difference in the industry of different men, but if you are an average man of our faculty you will find that in your professional duties you spend approximately $8\frac{1}{2}$ hours a day for $5\frac{1}{2}$ days a week during the academic year.

"Of the time devoted to the various activities you are probably spending about 20 per cent., in such miscellaneous activities as administration, professional reading, addresses, editorial work, etc., etc. Of this 20 per cent., possibly one-half is in strictly administrative work, such as committee work, faculty meetings, serving as faculty adviser, etc., the other half, in numerous professional activities differing so much from one individual to another that no classification for all our positions would be significant.

"In addition to this 20 per cent. of your time spent in miscellaneous activities, you are probably spending about 10 per cent. of your time in personal research. This does not include supervision and direction of the research work that might be more properly called the research work of your students. But it does include the time you take in having your research material published, in correcting proof, and in everything connected therewith.

"In addition to the 20 per cent. of your time spent on general professional activity and the 10 per cent. on personal research, the other 70 per cent. of your time is spent in regular instruction work. This includes preparation for the class periods, the correcting of papers, as well as the actual hours spent in the classroom.

"Having made a list of your activities and the amount of time devoted to each, your second problem is to estimate the relative value of all these activities with a view to putting less time on the least important and more time on the most important.

"You will undoubtedly find that most of your miscellaneous activities that were spoken of as 'administrative activities' are essential rather than important. You will undoubtedly agree that it is highly desirable that some of these activities should be reduced, particularly those that are performed by faculty members in order that clerical hire may be saved. You may find, however, that some of them are sufficiently important to justify an increased expenditure of your time.

"When you consider the value of your personal research, you will without any doubt regret that you have not paid more attention to this phase of your activities. You will discover that distinction in a professor is usually founded on successful

research; that men for our faculty positions are selected largely on the basis of research ability; that the most essential credential is a research degree; that promotions within the faculty are based very largely on research accomplishments; that the only official record made by the university of the members of this faculty is the record of the publications of each member of the faculty; that the administrative officers scan this list from year to year to see which men are engaged in productive research; that research is looked upon with favor by every one of your associates; that annually 80 of them secure results which are published in 300 articles or books.

"You may discover that we have a few highly treasured professors who never undertake any form of productive research, but you will certainly discover that all of your associates look with special approval upon the man of science after whose name there appears a star in the 'American Men of Science' and upon the men in all departments who are esteemed by the men in their own fields of learning as leaders in the methods, in the technique and in the results of productive research.

"When you come to consider the importance of the 70 per cent. of your time which you spend on instruction, you will find that this is not only the activity that consumes most of your time, but that it is also the most important of all your duties. You will find certain members of the faculty speaking of this function as though it were a necessary evil; as though positions in a university college would be fine if it were not for the students. Such men are of course out of place and should be in an agency intended for research and not for instruction. They probably do not know that the research professorships which were proposed a decade ago have in the main proved a failure, and that many of the research professorships that were begun have ceased because the occupants produced less than when their duties included a generous amount of instruction. . . .

"As a university professor you are at once an executive, a scientist, and an artist. You must be an executive to carry on successfully the administrative and miscellaneous duties that consume 20 per cent. of your time. You must be a scientist to secure results in the researches that consume 10 per cent. of your time. You must be an artist to inspire a love of learning in the

students of your classroom and to succeed in all the instructional duties that consume 70 per cent. of your time. Your duties as an executive are essential rather than important. Your activities as a scientist are important rather than essential. Your achievements as an artist are at once important and essential. . . .

"When you consider your preparation for instruction, unless you are a striking exception, you will discover that you have worked on the theory that college teachers are born and not made. In addition to the mastery of your particular field of learning, you have done little to make yourself a successful teacher. You have read but little on methods of instruction in your own field. You have taken no courses of instruction on methods of teaching in your particular field and your actual method of instruction is largely an imitation of some of your successful teachers. The head of your department gives you meager advice on methods of instruction and rarely attends your class to discover points which might be strengthened. You would regard yourself more or less insulted if the dean of the college, the head of your department or a colleague should presume to give you assistance on methods of teaching. . . .

"My plea at this time is that the members of this faculty shall attempt to review their various activities, to estimate their relative importance and to attempt to improve them. My chief plea, however, is that particular stress should be laid upon instruction; that the heads of departments should offer greater assistance to the men of their department; that groups of faculty members should hold conferences and encourage one another to take increased interest in instruction work; that men in 'one-man' departments should cooperate with men of other departments; that each man should invite several of his colleagues to attend his classes; that each man should attend the classes of several of his colleagues.

"The value of a university is not to be measured by the number of great administrators or even by the number of successful research scholars on the faculty. The truly great university is the one in which the administrative wisdom and the research skill of the members of the faculty are made effective by a personality and an ability so developed that they stimulate and

inspire a love of learning in the students in the classroom. Money, buildings, equipment, campus, enrollment—all these things do not make a university great. There is only one thing that makes a university great and that is a great faculty. There is only one thing that makes a faculty great and that is great ability to train students."—*Walter Dill Scott, Northwestern University, School and Society.*

PRESENT COLLEGE PROBLEMS.—"Equipped with such material and intellectual strength, a special service that the land-grant colleges can now render is to assist in the sane, economic, and social transition from the ideas of the past to the future organization of society, a transition inevitable as the result of the war and the increasing class consciousness. The land-grant colleges have always been peculiarly fitted to perform this service. One may hear in the atmosphere of some of the older educational establishments academic croakings about the newer state of affairs, bitter lamentations over the blighting effects of the new amendments of the Constitution of the United States. Did not a professor of psychology in a great university not long ago think that the suppression of alcohol would result in the repression of all poetic thought and sentiment and lead ultimately to atrocious social crimes? Did we not hear from the conservatives in other college circles occasionally expressions of fear for the blighting effect of the nineteenth amendment with applause for Tennessee or Connecticut endeavoring for a time to play the part of Horatius at the bridge? This reactionary conservatism is almost never met in genuine land-grant college circles; at most we find it growing like weeds in some neglected corner of our land-grant farms. On the other hand, since one extreme always begets another, we do not find in typical land-grant colleges the parlor red, the academic bolshevist and economic 'nut' such as to some extent infest other schools. Freed from the danger of both extremes, the workers in land-grant colleges are peculiarly fitted by antecedents and by temperament to assist wisely in bringing in the new era, an era in which the world thought will be more profoundly than ever influenced by the contributions, to use the words of Senator Morrill, of 'the agricultural and industrial classes.' "—*Samuel Avery, University of Nebraska, in Proceedings of the Association of Land Grant Colleges.*

GIFTS TO UNIVERSITIES.—"Under no circumstances should, or can, any self-respecting university accept a gift upon conditions which fix or hamper its complete freedom in the control of its own educational policies and activities. To accept a gift on condition that a certain doctrine or theory be taught or be not taught, or on condition that a certain administrative policy be pursued or be not pursued, is to surrender a university's freedom and to strike a blow at what should be its characteristic independence. Indeed, any donor who would venture to attempt to bind a university, either as to the form or the content of its teaching or as to its administrative policies, would be a dangerous person. Unless the public can have full faith in the intellectual and moral integrity of its universities and complete confidence that they direct and are responsible for their own policies, there can be no proper and helpful relationship between the universities and the public. A university may accept a gift to extend and improve its teaching of history, but it may not accept a gift to put a fixed and definite interpretation, good for all time, upon any facts of history. A university may accept a gift to increase the salaries of its professors, but it may not accept a gift for such purpose on condition that the salaries of professors shall never exceed a stated maximum, or that some professors shall be restricted as others are not in their personal, literary, or scientific activities. No university is so poor that it can afford to accept a gift which restricts its independence and no university is so rich that it would not be impoverished by an addition to its resources which tied the hands of its governing board."—*Nicholas Murray Butler, Annual Report, 1919.*

NATIONAL SURVEY OF STATE UNIVERSITIES.—" . . . Public higher education has progressed to the point where it is imperative that the maladjustment of educational facilities to regional and national requirements be remedied, that the function and spread of state higher institutions and their relationships to other educational agencies be redefined, and that a unified and consistent national policy for the development of higher education be outlined which will commend itself to the institutions concerned. A series of studies genuinely national in scope must underlie these determinations. For example, there must be investiga-

tions of the actual and potential resources of the states and of the nation that may be utilized for educational purposes; there must be estimates of the educational needs of given areas and communities much more careful and complete than any that have yet been attempted; there must be studies of the actual content and results of certain kinds of professional training, studies of the various experiments in reorganizing the administrative units of the educational system. The composite total if properly brought together and interpreted might pass for a national survey of state universities. But it would be more than that. It ought not to be undertaken unless more is contemplated. The separated land-grant colleges and teacher-training agencies are parts of the higher educational systems of all states and must be considered along with the state universities in determining state or national policies in the field of higher education. . . .

“ . . . Personally I think that the need for studies of this sort is the strongest argument for the creation of a Federal Department of Education. . . .

“It is probably clear to every administrator here that state institutions are reaching the limit of support from public funds under prevailing conditions of valuation and taxation of property. . . .

“Since the staffs of state higher institutions generally contain the leading local experts on economics and government, it seems obvious that the obligation rests upon state institutions to enlighten the public as to this emergency and to suggest practical remedies. . . .

“Specifically, then, I propose that this Association appoint a committee to consider the investigation by officers of the state-supported institutions in each state of the existing systems of state taxation. The Association should request the Association of Land Grant Colleges to appoint a similar committee, because in this matter the interests of state universities and land-grant colleges, where these institutions are separated, are identical. But this Association may properly take the initiative since the departments of economics and government in separated land-grant colleges are generally service departments and hence not so strongly developed. The joint committee's task would be, after general outline of the field, to suggest to the appropriate

institution of each state the kind of studies which might be made by their professors and advanced students. The joint committee would in the end bring together and interpret the results.

"The financial emergency now transcends all other problems. All state universities need more money than they are likely to get in the immediate future. As has been suggested, the potential supply is sharply limited by existing systems of taxation. This fact, coupled with the enormously increased demands made by university boards on public appropriating bodies, has led these bodies to insist upon the utmost economy in the expenditure of sums granted. I suspect there is a very general belief that universities are wastefully run. One encounters expression of this belief everywhere. The situation is not as bad as the lay critics think it is, but we must all admit that there is some measure of justification for the widespread conviction that part of the public money devoted to educational purposes goes to waste. It is clear that the existence of this conviction cannot safely be ignored. University officers should be prepared to demonstrate that the funds entrusted to them are used to the utmost advantage. This was always important. It is especially important now.

"I have happened to investigate the unit costs in several state institutions. This is not the place to indicate details, but those investigations revealed that it was possible for the institutions under consideration to effect very substantial savings by a more scientific distribution of the teaching load, more systematic use of building space, better classification of expenditures, and a more businesslike method of cost accounting in general. In the last few years a number of institutions have made still more searching analyses of the costs of every university function which abundantly prove the feasibility of large economies without diminishing the efficiency of either teaching or research. . . .

"... The domain of higher education has now become so broad that no institution, no matter how wealthy, can occupy it all. No university can any longer be universal. Every university must to a certain degree specialize. Its offerings must be adjusted to the needs of its constituents. As the field of knowledge continues to expand and professional specialties continue to multiply, certain universities will be forced to provide

new lines of training as yet unforeseen. If they are to serve their constituencies adequately with the money available, they must likewise be prepared to drop those divisions or departments, the maintenance of which cannot be justified on the ground of educational necessity.

"These considerations suggest that the public higher institutions should study the national aspects of enterprise in which they are engaged. My third and final recommendation to this body is, therefore, that it participate in a kind of preliminary or superficial survey of the distribution of opportunities for advanced and professional training at higher institutions throughout the country. Obviously other groups of institutions would be as much interested in such a survey as the members of this Association, for example, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers Colleges, and the Association of National Schools, and perhaps the Association of Medical Colleges and the Association of Law Schools. You are probably aware that all of these associations except one are represented in the American Council on Education. The principal object for which the Council was founded was 'to promote and carry out cooperative action in matters of common interest to the associations represented.' Consequently I would suggest, if this proposition meets with your approval, that the National Association of State Universities petition the American Council on Education in terms somewhat as follows:

"That the Council appoint a joint committee composed of representatives of the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers Colleges, and such other groups of professional institutions as seem to be concerned, to undertake a preliminary survey of the distribution of facilities for professional training and graduate study in public and private institutions in the United States, and that the Council be requested to ask the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Education in prosecuting the study."—*S. P. Capen, Transactions of the National Association of State Universities, 1920.*

THE FAILURE OF THE COLLEGE.—" . . . Where it is making its egregious blunder is in attempting to educate these three classes together. . . .

- (1) Those of high intellectual endowment who will pursue an academic life;
- (2) Those of equally high intellectual endowment who are training for important administrative or professional work;
- (3) Those who enter college primarily with a view to its social side, and who lack the native ability, the intellectual training, or the ambition necessary for the pursuit of any work of a high scholastic order. With this class may be included a small group of faithful students who, through lack of native endowment, in spite of severe exertion, are unable to keep the pace set by the first two classes.

"When, within a group, great differences in the degree of intelligence exist, sound group instruction becomes impossible. . . .

"To neglect the best, those who are to make a large social return, is nothing less than the folly of misguided democracy. . .

"*'Either learn or depart'* must be written on the portals. . . .

"It is probably true that if the third and fourth year education is to be reasonably effective, the lower quarter or even half of the second-year class should be made to withdraw. . . .

"Moreover, the best students will be taught by those members of the department who may be expected to arouse enthusiasm and create followers, whereas the larger mediocre group may be handled by instructors who are appointed primarily as teachers, and not because of ability as original investigators. . . .

"If we fail to educate these, the leaders of society, it is nothing short of intellectual suicide. A system of education is ill-balanced which does not give the maximum encouragement to the best minds. . . .

"Their most lofty service will be shown in the production of a small body of original investigators and highly trained experts who are to advance knowledge and meet the crises of our national and international life. . . .

"College authorities resemble government officials in their extreme dislike of making up their minds. . . .

"If an institution at the end of the successive college years cannot give sound educational guidance, commerce and the professions devised for other purposes can hardly be expected to afford the guidance which the college is afraid to give. . . .

"Financial and athletic leadership is present in abundance; intellectual leadership is lacking. Should not our higher institutions foster learning with the same eager calculation as that with which they produce strong class loyalty and great respect for vicarious athletic prowess? . . .

"The relative urgency of the problem facing the college determines the direction of thought. At the present moment, the minds of the chosen leaders are not grappling with the true problems of the college. . . ."—*J. Crosby Chapman.*

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following ninety nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions* and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 1, 1921.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealy (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

R. B. Abbott (Physics), Purdue
Stanley Alden (English), Smith
George Alfred Baitzell (Zoology), Yale
W. H. Blair (Physics), Purdue
Alden Forrest Barss (Horticulture), British Columbia
Hubert Emerson Bice (Commerce), Syracuse
H. S. Bill (Art), Missouri
Francis Gilman Blake (Medicine), Yale
Samuel T. Bratton (Geology), Missouri
Thomas B. Brown (Physics), George Washington
Courtney Bruerton (Modern Languages), Tufts
James Wm. Buchanan (Zoology), Yale
Arthur H. Buffinton (History), Williams
Earnest W. Burgus (Sociology), Chicago
A. G. Capps (Education), Missouri
William L. Cheney (Physics), George Washington
Charles S. Collier (Law), George Washington
J. Norton Cru (French), Williams
Bliss F. Dana (Plant Pathology), Washington State
Richard H. Dearborn (Electrical Engineering), Oregon Agricultural
P. H. Dirstine (Pharmacy), Washington State
C. S. Doan (Mathematics), Purdue
Mary V. Dover (Chemistry), Missouri
John T. Erwin (Mathematics), George Washington

*Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

W. H. Eyster (Botany), Missouri
John Fulton (Chemistry), Oregon Agricultural
Frank Goodrich (History), Williams
Florence A. Gragg (Latin), Smith
G. H. Graves (Mathematics), Purdue
Robert F. Griggs (Botany), George Washington
Clarence Holmes Growdon (Psychology), Ohio (Athens)
Addison Gulick (Physiology), Missouri
Etta H. Handy (Home Economics), Washington State
Samuel Clark Harvey (Medicine), Yale
George H. Hill (Pathology), Yale
Carl Sherman Hoar (Biology), Williams
E. F. Hopkins (Botany), Missouri
John T. Hoyle (Industries), Carnegie Institute
Frederick B. Kaye (English), Northwestern
Elmer Louis Kayser (History), George Washington
Robert R. Kern (Economics), George Washington
David Lambuth (English), Dartmouth
John R. Lapham (Civil Engineering), George Washington
Henry Laurens (Physiology), Yale
Anna Christine McBride (Social Work), Carnegie Institute
M. A. McCall (Agriculture), Washington State
Otto McCreary (Agriculture), Washington State
Brainerd Mears (Chemistry), Williams
M. G. Mehl (Geology), Missouri
Horacé G. Merten (English), Washington State
E. B. Millard (Chemistry), Mass. Inst. Tech.
Orilla E. Miner (Photography), Washington State
J. H. Minnick (Education), Pennsylvania
A. B. Moore (History), Iowa State College
Arthur Henry Morse (Medicine), Yale
Robert E. Park (Sociology), Chicago
James H. Platt (Engineering), George Washington
George H. Pritchard (Physical Education), Drury
W. H. Pyle (Psychology), Missouri
T. B. Robb (Economics), Missouri
W. Carson Ryan, Jr. (Education), Swarthmore
J. L. St. John (Chemistry), Washington State
Hermann Schoenfeld (German), George Washington

A. F. W. Schmidt (German), George Washington
W. P. Shortridge (History), Louisville
J. W. Simonton (Law), Missouri
G. V. Skelton (Engineering), Oregon Agricultural
Anthony Spuler (Zoology), Washington State
Wilbut W. Swingle (Zoology), Yale
G. W. Tannreuther (Zoology), Missouri
John Sidney Turner (Mathematics), Iowa State College
H. T. Vance (Commerce), Oregon Agricultural
William C. Van Vleck (Law), George Washington
Earl F. Walker (Chemistry), Washington State
Willibald Weniger (Physics), Oregon Agricultural
Roy O. Westley (Agriculture), Washington State
C. H. Williams (Education), Missouri

Bennett M. Brigman (Engineering), Louisville
N. Andrew N. Cleven (History), Pittsburgh
Harry T. Collings (Economics), Pennsylvania
A. Nowell Creadick (Medicine), Yale
George B. Hatfield (History), Pittsburgh
Albert F. Hill (Botany), Yale
Helen Sand Hughes (English), Wellesley
Clarence H. Kennedy (Zoology), Ohio
John P. Peters, Jr. (Medicine), Yale
Alfred T. Sholel (Pediatrics), Yale
Lucretia V. T. Simmons (German), Pennsylvania State
William Christopher Stadie (Medicine), Yale
James W. Whaler (English), Maine



22



